

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

APPELLANT:	ERIC T. LAMBERT ET AL)	
)	Group Art Unit: 3687
SERIAL NUMBER:	09/751,585)	
)	Examiner:
FILED:	December 29, 2000)	Eric T. Lambert
)	
FOR:	METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR)	Confirmation No. 8383
	ELECTRONICALLY QUALIFYING)	
	SUPPLIER PARTS)	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed July 10, 2008, the Appellants submit the following reply as follows:

ARGUMENT

In addition to the previously presented arguments filed in the Appellants' Reply Brief dated August 6, 2007, the Appellants further submit the following in response to the Examiner's Supplemental Answer dated July 10, 2008.

The Examiner presents new grounds of rejection on page 7 of the Answer. In particular, the Examiner concedes in section 9(a), that neither Ferriter nor Ensel nor Aycock teach the use of a status box. Throughout prosecution, the Examiner has maintained that this feature is common knowledge in the art, and so did not present any reference in support. In this new ground of rejection, the Examiner claims that Weinberger teaches this status box to indicate approval status to users. However, the Examiner does not point to any particular location in this 184-page document to support such a claim. Upon a review of the reference, the Weinberger appears to disclose ***distribution boxes*** 217 that are used to distribute digital and analog video streams to the audio-video seat distribution units 231 at the passenger seats 123 (column 10, lines 39-41, emphasis added by Appellants). Weinberger makes reference to 'status' whereby the area distribution box 217 "processor/s monitor the status of the AC power output to each individual AVU column for BIT/BITE purposes" (column 21, lines 63-65). Another reference to 'status' is provided in column 43, in which passengers are provided with the ability to make telephone calls whereby the system 100 "displays phone call status on the screen of the seat display 122...include[ing] Invalid credit card, No available lines, All lines busy, Called line busy, Call disconnected, Invalid phone number entered, and Call in-progress" (column 43, lines 5-18).

The Appellants fail to appreciate how the distribution box disclosed in Weinberger, which monitors signal status of telephone calls, relates to the Appellants' claimed status box for indicating approval status with respect to a supplier part. Moreover, as previously argued by the Appellants in the Reply Brief dated August 6, 2007, the Examiner has relied on Weinberger, which is in the ***passenger entertainment system art***, in his rejection of the present invention, which is in the ***supplier parts qualification art***. A person of ordinary skill in the supplier parts qualification art would ***not*** look to the passenger entertainment system art to solve the problem treated by the claimed invention (i.e., a implementing parts qualification for supplier parts). In

addition, Weinberger does not deal with the same problem solved by the claimed invention. Weinberger is directed to providing “for a networked passenger entertainment system that integrates audio, video, passenger information...receive video, audio and game data for entertainment purposes, and communicate with other passengers and computers on- and off-board the aircraft, and which thereby provides for passenger selected delivery of content over a communication network” (Weinberger, Column 1, lines 16-27). By contrast, the present invention is directed to facilitating *parts qualification processes relating to supplier participants*. In sum, Weinberger is not even remotely close to the field of technology of the claimed invention, nor does it deal with the same problem solved by the claimed invention. Thus, Weinberger is nonanalogous art, and the Examiner’s reliance on Weinberger for allegedly teaching the Appellants’ recited status box for indicating approval status of supplier parts is, therefore, improper. Accordingly, the Appellants submit that it is inappropriate to rely on Weinberger to suggest that the status boxes recited in the context of the elements of the Appellants claims are *common knowledge in the art* as suggested by the Examiner. For at least this reason, the rejections based upon Weinberger are improper, and should be reversed.

For at least the reasons advanced above, the Appellants submit that claims 40-71 patentably define over Ferriter, Ensel, Aycock, and Weinberger.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is urged that the final rejection of claims 40-71 be overturned. The final rejection is in error and should be reversed. The fee set forth in 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) is enclosed herewith. If there are any additional charges with respect to this Reply Brief, or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC T. LAMBERT ET AL

By: /Marisa J. Dubuc/

Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 48915

Date: September 10, 2008